DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 690 HE 016 615

AUTHOR Riesman, David
TITLE Selection Procedures for College and University Presidents: Search and Destroy Missions?
INSTITUTION Boston Coll., Chestnut Hill, MA. School of Education.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 36p.; Address delivered at the Rev. Charles F. Donovan Lecture Series (4th).
AVAILABLE FROM Boston College, School of Education, Office of the Dean, Chestnut Hill, MA 02167.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Qualifications; *Administrator Selection; *College Presidents; *Confidentiality; *Disclosure; Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; *Individual Characteristics; Participative Decision Making; Privacy; Publicity; *Spouses; Student Reaction

ABSTRACT

The process of selecting college presidents is discussed. It is suggested that the selection is affected by the conflict between privacy and publicity, a balance that differs among different kinds of institutions: a relatively closed search because of religious affiliation or dogma for a private college versus the requirements established for state institutions operating under Sunshine Laws or Open Records Laws. Basic considerations are as follows: how the search is to be conducted (e.g., the number of candidates to be considered); the kind of qualities and background experiences desired for the president; inclusion of students on the search committees; the extent to which the spouse of the presidential candidate is considered; search committee members' tendency to avoid making a personal judgment about the candidate; the likelihood that the search committee will not select candidates who have gained the label "controversial"; the role of the incumbent president during the search; the role of the spouse of women college presidents; and distinguishing between issues that should be decided by full disclosure versus those that should be secret and confidential. Research on the selection of the college president conducted jointly by David Riesman and Judith McLaughlin is summarized. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED234690

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS: SEARCH AND DESTORY MISSIONS?

by

Dr. David Riesman

THE FOURTH
REV. CHARLES F. DONOVAN, S.J.
LECTURE

Sponsored by the
School of Education
Boston College

1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY David Riesman TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 016 615

The Lecture Series

The Rev. Charles F. Donovan, S.J. Annual Lecture Series was established by the Boston College School of Education in 1979. The series of lectures is a small effort on the part of the faculty in Education to honor and pay professional tribute to the founding dean of the school whose leadership and service have contributed much toward the improvement of teacher education in America.

Through the lecture series, an opportunity will be provided to invite an outstanding educator to the Boston College campus each year to address the University community on a timely issue in higher education.

3

DAVID RIESMAN, Ph.D.

Dr. Riesman is a graduate of Harvard College where he majored in bio-chemical sciences. He attended Harvard Law School and after graduation, spent a year as Research Fellow at Harvard working with Professor Carl J. Friedrich. He also served as Law clerk to Mr. Justice Brandeis of the U.S. Supreme Court. He later was a Research Fellow at Columbia Law School where his interests brought him into contact with Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead. He studied psychoanalysis with Erich Fromm and Harry Sullivan, and so set the life-pattern of study, research, writing, and teaching.

Dr. Riesman began his career practicing law in Boston. He went on to the Buffalo Law School as Professor of Law. During the Second World War he was Contract Termination Director at the Sperry Gyroscope Company. He went on to the University of Chicago where he was a member of the Social Sciences faculty. In 1958, Dr. Riesman became Henry Ford II Professor of Social Sciences at Harvard. He has taught at Yale, and was Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Sussex; in 1968-69 he was a member of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford; and in 1971-72, a member of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton.

His extensive research and study have resulted in many publications. Included among these are *Abundance for What? and other Essays, The Lonely Crowd, Faces in the Crowd, and Individualism Reconsidered.* His more recent research has been concerned with the development and present state of higher education. Publications include *Constraint and Variety in American Education.* He co-authored with Christopher Jencks, *The Academic Revolution;* and also co-authored *Academic Values and Mass Education.* In 1980, Dr. Riesman's book, *On Higher Education: The Academic Enterprise in an Era of Rising Student Consumerism* was published. His research currently is centered on the college and university presidency.

David Riesman holds many memberships in distinguished societies and is the recipient of a great number of awards and honors. These include election to the American Philosophical

Society. The American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the National Academy of Education, and the Century Association. He has received awards from the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Council in Education, and the International Society for Political Psychology. He holds honorary degrees from prestigious colleges and universities, including University of California at Berkeley, the University of Pennsylvania, Fordham University, and the University of Sussex.

SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS: SEARCH AND DESTROY MISSIONS?

David Riesman, Ph.D.
Henry Ford II
Professor of Social Sciences
Harvard University

I

Thank you Father Monan, Father Fahey, Father Donovan for being both generous and warm friends. To study how colleges and universities go about selecting a new president is not only to gain entree into widely discussed problems of educational leadership without our diverse non-system of post-secondary education. It also provides a way of examining general conflicts in our society between privacy and publicity, and between the keeping of confidences and the betrayal of trust. In presidential searches as in other affairs, conflict of values is sometimes framed as one between the supposed public's "right to know" which populists and journalists advocate, and the right to privacy sought by individuals and groups engaged in negotiations. Along with the insistence that, perhaps especially when public moneys are being spent, accountability requires that every act be subject to public scrutiny not only through post-audit but at the time of decision, is the insistence of various academic constituencies that decisions which affect them require their participation. In controversies over searches, it is often hard to draw the line between the contention, for example, that students' lives are affected by the decision on the president and hence they have

[1]I am indebted to Mrs. Judith McLaughlin, a doctoral candidate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, for collaboration on both the research and interpretations in this address. Our work was made possible by support from the Ford, Spencer, and Exxon Educational Foundations and the Lilly Endowment. Support to continue the work has come from the Mellon Foundation and the Institute for Educational Affairs.

a right to take part in the process, or indeed that the environing community is affected and has a similar stake, and the claim that the entire public, represented by the press and those speaking for various interest groups, should be present as well as kept generally informed.

When educational institutions are growing and flourishing, there is always interest but generally less anxiety concerning the choice of an executive. However, during a period of widespread retrenchment, it seems evident that educational leaders need to have the courage to displease various constitutencies. If cutbacks are to be made which can actually strengthen an institution rather than weaken it further, some constituencies will suffer more than others which may in fact, because of their market value, obtain enhanced resources despite general decline. In my judgment, presidents will not be found with the courage to displease any vocal and potentially troublesome group when the campaign for the presidency is an open and clearly political one, attracting those who have nothing to lose by campaigning for the position, because they do not hold or cannot keep a good position currently, and who are willing to placate all potentially influential constituencies to obtain the job. Such a search process comes to resemble a political campaign, rather than the more subtle and hidden maneuvers of academic ambition.

The balance between publicity and privacy differs among different sorts of institutions. The federal Affirmative Action guidelines require that a search be made for qualified members of minority groups including white as well as minority women. Affirmative Action requires that such individuals be considered, but not that they be in any particular case selected. It is due to the women's movements and the availability of capable women executives that most women's colleges today are selecting women as their presidents, or expect to do so when they next choose a president. Pressures for Affirmative Action have their greatest impact in state systems of higher education. The system permits the allocation of positions to one or another institution in terms of seeing to it that a woman or black or Hispanic male has a presidency somewhere in the system. One can find this pattern in the com-

munity colleges of Massachusetts or California; in the state college and university systems of Minnesota and California; also in the choice of chancellor of the state system in Florida, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire.

In contrast, at other public places only a "good ole boy," preferably local, will be seriously considered. There is still great variety among public institutions, but there is both greater freedom and diversity among the private ones. In the independent sector, the process of final selection has in a few cases been kept within the board of trustees up to the very end. More commonly, the search committee is in fact a screening committee, which is asked to propose a pool of three or more candidates for presentation to the board of trustees. Sometimes the slate is ranked and sometimes unranked.

In searches as a whole, there is great diversity in the size of the committees chosen to conduct them. This may range from a small select body of trustees, faculty, staff, and now commonly students to a large constituency-oriented committee with as many as 30 or 40 members. In other cases, search and selection are not separate, but the same committee does both, the final approval of the board of trustees having become perfunctory. And indeed there are participatory private institutions where the final decisions rest with the faculty as a matter of long standing practice — Oberlin is an example. Indeed, I would lay it down as a general rule that, though there are some notable exceptions, presidents cannot last long against united opposition from the faculty, few in any case would want to.

Among our Jesuit institutions, searches for the presidents of these twenty-eight institutions have up to this point maintained a different character from searches in most other institutions. When LaMoyne College was faced with the impossible task of finding a successor to Father J. Donald Monan, I asked myself whether having become "independent" (as all but the Vincentians have done in New York State), they would feel compelled to follow Affirmative Action guidelines. But when they were able to recruit Father Haig who had been at Wheeling College, there was to my knowledge no contention that they should have searched actively for women and/or black lay

individuals. The choice of regular or diocesan priests or nuns for Catholic or once-Catholic institutions is not mandated in Catholic doctrine. There are of course many lay presidents of such colleges today. Rather, the LeMoyne choice reflects Jesuit practice, which I assume will continue at least as long as there are enough Jesuits with vocations and administrative talents who are willing to serve (even to supply the first Jesuit President of the Catholic University of America). To be sure, Jesuit Provincials want to keep "their" religious within their geographic boundaries whenever possible. Yet despite territorial claims, in the Catholic institutions in general searches occur in a national pool in contrast with the search practices in some of the most sectarian Protestant colleges. For example, among some members of the evangelical Christian College Coalition, the Preisdent is apt to be a minister of the appropriate sect and chosen withing regional boundaries where possible, though such confinement is not always possible because in many of these colleges, the theological guidelines result in a very small pool of eligible candidates. For example, many require a belief in biblical literalism and in the inerrancy of the Bible quite alien to Catholic doctrine. It is possible that Cardinal Newman College in St. Louis, a tiny institution not yet accredited, combines with its curricular uniformity a similar insistence on what might be thought of as pre-Vatican II ranges of theological positions. But in general virtually all the colleges founded by Catholics possess an intellectual freedom and diversity of theological opinion and biblical interpretation inconceivable in the era of the Baltimore Catechism; the names mentioned by Father Monan are splendid illustrations. Faculties particularly of the Jesuit institutions are recruited on a national basis from individuals of all religious persuasions within and outside Catholicism. They include those many academicians who deny that they are religious, even though they are likely to profess what Robert Bellah and others would call civil religions, whether it be American nationalism or one or another version of Marxism, or the interstitial unavowed religion that the anthropologist, Mary Douglas, declares to be endemic to the human condition.

II

The chances for a relatively closed search because of religious affiliation or dogma depend on the ability of the private institutions to survive and to retain some freedom of action in choice of administration and indeed of staff. But the opposite extreme exists in those state institutions which operate under so-called Sunshine Laws or Open Records Laws which require searches to be conducted in the glare of publicity. The press and any citizen are entitled to know the names of all the candidates or rather applicants, to read the recommendations, and to listen to the discussions among members of the search committee concerning qualifications.

I can testify from studying some of these searches, as can my collaborator Judith McLaughlin, that the needs of the institution drop quickly from view as contending constituents stake out their terrain and as good candidates only rarely will come forward to be exposed to the circus of publicity with every conversation recorded and with public discussions of the search committee concerning candidates. Indeed, in Sunshine Law states, the announcements of a position often ask for applicants rather than nominations of candidates; there will indeed be applicants. Candidates are generally well-known, and are well-placed, and must be courted privately at least in the first stages of the search. Applicants are often assistant professors who recognize that they will not get tenure where they are, and have nothing to lose when their application becomes known. Two years ago when Texas A&M sought to conduct a search in which only a few finalists would be brought to campus, arguing that the Texas Open Records Law did not govern universities, they were taken to court by both the student paper and the local paper in College Station. The University lost the case. This and other experiences led Kenneth Ashworth, the Chancellor of the Texas State University System, along with Trustees and others on behalf of the state institutions, to appeal to the Texas Legislature for an exemption from the law for presidential searches. (Based on my own experience, I wrote a memorandum for the legislature indicating the harm I believe to be done to

academic leadership by the unwillingness of capable individuals to expose themselves to the lottery of a completely open search. I also emphasized that the openness of search committee deliberations inhibits the search committee from intelligent discussion for fear that a stray remark might be picked up by some constituency as improper or hostile to its interests. The legislature adjourned without amending the law, under newspaper and other pressure against "elitist" secrecy.

Even in states which do not have sunshine laws but where the public institution has any visibility at all, the belief prevails that accountability to the public means that the search should be open even where the search committee and board of trustees have become persuaded that open searches produce what appear to be plausible candidates and dreadful incumbents. Their efforts at confidentiality are interferred with by aggressive and self-righteous journalists, faculty members possessed by the venial sin of vanity and, much more commonly by faculty members and other search committee members who violate the promise of confidentiality that they have made in order to damage one candidacy or advance another.

We are all aware that confidentiality has sometimes been abused to cover the misbehavior of criminals and miscreants. However, the conclusion that the abuses of executive privilege that we have seen justify abandoning secrecy of any kind is extravagant. The recent climate of mistrust has its basis in part in an American ethos which regards by their very nature all secrets as unfair, elitist, and exclusionary. The audience is rarely outraged in the mass media by the violations of privacy of non-celebrities, for example when photographers invade a home to picture a grieving family whom they inform of a death or a suicide in the family. Foreigners, official and otherwise, fear to talk with Americans because of the danger of leaks either at the time or in later memoirs.

III

To return to presidential searches, corporate trustees find it difficult to understand why in

higher education people are not groomed for succession to a presidency as they are for the position of chief executive officer in a corporation. There are instances where this is attempted but in fact there are very few instances where it works. In most private and some public academic institutions, the search for a president is almost invariably a complex and arduous matter. Indeed, the search process highlights, like a projective test such as the Rorschach, all the complexities of the institution. The first conflicts occur over how the search is to be conducted. Commonly the trustees delegate the search for three or four potentially eligible candidates to a committee which, as already mentioned, includes some trustees, some carefully selected or elected faculty, representatives from the staff and the alumni and alumnae, and students who are usually taken from the elected student leadership. Some selection committees are far too large for successful meetings with candidates unless they divide up, as they generally do. It that case, some subgroup must depend on the judgments of all the other subgroups in reporting on the candidates they have interviewed or whose files they have reviewed.

Size itself says something about the number of constituencies who believe that they have a claim to be represented. In a major university this will include representatives from the various professional schools as well as the divisions within the faculties of Arts and Sciences. In a number of cases, commonly in public institutions even when there is no Sunshine Law and in some private institutions, representatives of the local community are also included if there is a boundary that can be said to define a community.

Even while the search and selection processes are being framed, the institution is being forced to look at itself in terms of what it sees as its missions and its needs. These reflect the history and traditions of the place; they may also reflect attitudes toward the predecessor president. Often the latter has departed later than what would have been optimal, sometimes because the board of trustees has put off doing anything, perhaps knowing from previous experience how painful and agonizing a search procedure can be.

Rarely today does an institution have a president for so long a time that no one remembers the previous search.

In any case, the board will probably read the useful manual by John Nason based on search procedures prepared for the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities. But generalities may not eliminate the particular problems of the succession crisis and local hazards and opportunities. Increasingly, in the public as well as the private sectors, professional search consultants are brought in. These may be non-profit groups like the services provided by the Association of American Colleges or by the Academy for Educational Development, or "head-hunting" executive recruiting firms such as Peat, Marwick & Mitchell or Heidrick & Struggles which have a branch devoted to presidential searches.

IV

As we study the progress of a search, we ask ourselves: does this institution judge its past as a warning? For example, does it desire a president who will be drastically different from his or her predecessor? Is the future viewed as a target of opportunity, the way perhaps to advance the institution in the face of general recession and retrenchment?. A chance to pick up a few good faculty and create a spirit of renewal? Or is the institution unrealistic about itself, as is so very common, believing that the geographic and other disasters which beset both public and private institutions in the Northeast and the Middle West are applicable to everybody else but not to them? Are they so convinced of their own great qualities that they cannot imagine anyone not wanting to be their president? Or imagine that a president who would be any use to them would need to make some very drastic changes? Do they want someone who will be seen as an educator as well as a manager or are they so desperate for a manager that they hope to find someone who can manage and raise money without bothering anyone?

The belief that one can have a president who knows little and cares little and learns little about the institution is one of the mistakes a

number of search committees make. For a very short time, a whirlwind sales person may be able to capture some vain and gullible donors. I am not suggesting that a president must come up the academic ladder. Any outstanding ones come from government service, from the law, occasionally from medicine and from corporate life. But unless the president makes a great effort to become fully aware of the educational innards of the institution, its physiology, he or she will be unable to make a case of lasting value as to why the instituion should remain afloat among all the other competing colleges and other competitors for limited resources. The belief that a manager can sell a product with which he's had no hands on experience or at least a closely vicarious one is one of the illusions of our corporate world as well.

There are many pressures which complicate a presidential search. One of the commonest of these is the demand by students that they should have a say in "decisions which affect our lives." This slogan is sometimes effective vis-a-vis permeable academic institutions. Neither students nor other citizens can affect Supreme Court decisions or Soviet and, for the most part, American defense-offense policies, nor can students have much influence on the demographic factors or the general economic conditions which influence their education and their futures profoundly.

The judgment that students should be included on search committees (and also when finalists visits a campus) is an aspect of the general judgment that, if presidents are appointed who have not been screened by committees in which all constituencies are represented, they will lack legitimacy. In the larger political and cultural arena, none of the issues we are dealing with is new in American life. Arguments against smoke-filled rooms and Woodrow Wilson's naive belief in open covenants openly arrived at are examples from our past. But it was in the 1960's that the pressure in the universities and in society for what came to be called participatory democracy reached its peak. In practice participatory democracy has meant that in small groups such as the small college faculty or town meeting everyone has a right to be heard. But it has come

to signify in search procedures that every specifiable interest has a right to have a representative of its constituency involved in the search. Participatory democracy has suffered from cynicism and mistrust and also from the solipsism and even anarchy that characterize much of academic life.

Moreover, to a large extent, Americans have already moved beyond participatory toward plebiscitary democracy. It would be surprising if members of one faction in a department felt that the other faction could speak for them or that the head of the department could speak for them. Even the most publicized searches do not leave people satisfied that their views have been represented when their views have not prevailed. Somehow they believe a secret deal was made, a secret conversation held, perhaps even outside the state so as to avoid either state laws or intrusive journalists who claim a "right to know." Thus I do not believe that an open search creates any more legitimacy for the candidate than a closed search. He or she will after all be the candidate of one faction and not of all factions. The candidate of all factions, like any plausible candidate for political office, may well be an unprincipled person representative of nothing. Certainly no leader.

VI

The question must then be asked can a president chosen without the consultation of conceivable constituencies be regarded as legitimate. The answer will probably be found in the ability of a president to legitimate himself or herself by tactful behavior as an incumbent. I have seen some presidents who do this quickly and with ease. I think of a new president in a private Southern university who, before his arrival on campus as president, a rather hierarchical place, asked to have dinner with a group of students, both leaders and students in general who wanted to meet with him. Another president chose as his academic vice president one of the faculty members known for his savage criticism of the administration, but with whom the new president believed he could work and who would of course facilitate his legitimation with critical faculty.

It seems to me that members of the board could be of help, as would even members of the search committee were they to stay around and be available for a time to advise and orient the new president. They are often the only individuals on campus that the person coming in has met or known well.

Much of our research has concentrated on the still typical situation of the male president and a wife who does not pursue a full-time career or puts it on the back burner as she acts like a Foreign Service Officer's wife in a hardship post. She is her husband's principal confidante, often a main source of communication, an additional pair of eyes and ears with different orbits, differest perspectives. (Jesuit presidents, although of course lacking a spouse, ordinarily have a religious community on campus which is generally although not invariably supportive; sometimes in Catholic colleges the religious superior is the academic subordinate.) While Jesuit and other single presidents tend to be limited by the perspective of a single sex in spite of the great empathy many develop for the opposite sex, they also have the advantage of not suffering from the anxieties of married presidents concerning their lack of attention to their spouses and the high visibility from which the latter suffer, pressures often more troubling when there are presidential children in the local school.

In general in liberal arts colleges and research universities alike, the position of the president is a lonely one. One should not underestimate the vacuum into which a new president sometimes moves in which faculty and administrators are afraid to appear to seek favors by approaching him or her.

In studying search processes, Judith McLaughlin and I have discovered great variations in the extent to which consideration is given to the spouse. In the majority of cases, the president is male and married. His decision whether or not to accept an offer of the presidency is likely to be greatly influenced by his wife's judgment as to how the new environment will suit both him and her and also their children if any; she will want to know a

great deal about the new milieu. However, these desires of the spouse to become informed during the search have in recent years tended to be subordinated by misinterpretations of Affirmative Action and by fear of the attitudes of the women's movements or their radical wings toward any woman who does any volunteer work without a name on the door and a salary.

Two searches in recent years suggest how greatly women can affect their husband's chances both as candidates and as incumbents. In one case the journalist asked the president's wife how she felt about moving from a cosmopolitan city to a small town. She replied that she went where her husband did and it did not matter to her; she could adjust and be happy anywhere where he was. In this small community such a wife would be appreciated by some local residents, but certainly not by all the faculty including women faculty who would be antagonistic to such a traditional attitude. In another case of a distinguished liberal arts college it was taken for granted that the spouse should behave as her predecessor had done entertaining constantly and accompanying her husband on fund raising trips. She was willing to take part in ceremonial occasions and to entertain the board and the faculty on occasion. But she paid no attention to the local surrounding community which had expected attention from the president's wife for various voluntary activities and for opening up her house for such activities: the presidential house which is rarely a home. Matters came to a head when the president's wife decided to return to her earlier employment and started looking for a job. She was waited on by a committee of the board who told her that the wife of the president of X college does not work. It all ended up with the dismissal of the president in the middle of the academic year.

VII

I have been speaking of the contribution of spouses, which in rare instances can be negative. My experience on one search committee

and my observation of others has led me to conclude, as many men have concluded, that women have better judgment of people than most men do. Of course this is not a gender universal: some women are much poorer judges than most men and some men are better judges than virtually all women. However, from infancy onward, in general, girls are attuned to people, and boys are more attuned to things or, at a later age, to gangs and games. Perhaps more important, the difference in physiology leads to a greater awareness of the future on the part of women. They are more apt to look ahead, whether out of fear of pregnancy, in some cases, or the happy duress of pregnancy in others. They seek longer-term commitments than many men do. Above all, on search committees they are less impatient, less eager to settle on something and to get the job done with. This has remained true despite the women's movements. So has the fact that, as members of boards, as faculty, staff, student, and alumnae members of search committees, their voices are generally softer — there are a few Bella Abzug types, of course, but usually women's comments are more restrained and tentative.

I have recommended to the Association of Governing Boards that workshops be conducted for women members of search committees, and certainly women members of boards of trustees, so as to give them greater self-confidence, the kind of confidence that continuing education has provided for a number of women at this institution and others. (I am not discussing here instances which I have also observed where women members of search committees have been concerned with Affirmative Action as their first priority, and not with the choice of the best person in terms of the needs, often the desperate needs, of the institution.)

VIII

One overall criticism I would make of many search committees, which is one I would make of most committees and of my fellow Americans in general, and this is that we will do almost

anything to escape making a personal judgment. We seek refuge in credentials, and letters of recommendation which are usually inflated and sometimes maliciously deflated, and in committee actions where the responsibility of our individual voices, and espeically that "different voice" of women about which my colleague Carol Gilligan has written, are muffled in the general consensus.

As already suggested, observations of many searches have led Judith McLaughlin and me to begin with the tacit assumption that confidentiality in presidential searches is of the utmost importance. We have followed informally a number of searches and have observed the success of several cases in liberal arts colleges where mutual trust permitted complete confidentiality, with the outcome being the selection by an enthusiastic search committee of a candidate who met the criteria that had been decided upon as reflecting the institution's present needs. In a number of these cases, a search committee's choice was of an oustanding president who would not have been willing to stand as a candidate without the assurance of confidentiality.

In the early stages of our research, Judith McLaughlin had prepared a questionnaire that was sent to all public and private colleges and universities which, during the five-month recruiting period of 1980-81, had landed a president. The questionnaire, in addition to asking about the composition of the search committee and whether it was a selection committee which reported to the board of trustees or actually combined search with selection, laid out a number of scenarios dealing with the degree of confidentiality sought and in fact maintained during the course of the search. These ranged from the complete openness of the searches required by Sunshine Laws in Florida and other states, where everything, including discussions and rankings among search committee members concerning candidates, must be carried on in public, through the whole range to the kind of search just mentioned where confidentiality is preserved throughout.

The full and candid replies we received to the questionnaire (and of course we promised con-

fidentiality) reflected the desperate anxieties the search process induces for its serious participants. Unlike the usual situation with mailed questionnaires, many busy search committee heads were eager to respond (and this was fairly balanced between public and independent institutions, great universities and small liberal arts colleges). A number of the persons chairing search committees, in many cases those who chaired the board of trustees, responded that they had sought to keep the search confidential but at some point there had been a leak, almost invariably with deleterious consequences for the college. Viable candidates had eliminated themselves, and others who in some cases had merely been nominated and had not actually offered to become candidates were damaged in their current locations through suspicions of disloyalty or of using the institution as a stepping stone to presumably better things.

IX

On the basis of these returns to the questionnaire, Judith McLaughlin inaugurated some detailed case studies, from which I will take two examples, one a major state university, the other a nationally known private liberal arts college. In this latter case, desirable candidates withdrew the moment their names were leaked, making clear to their colleagues that they had not been actively seeking a presidency and would certainly have been ambivalent about making any move. Highly regarded where they are now, they are neither privately wounded nor publicly sullied by a failure to be selected in a search from which they had withdrawn.

However, the story of the search at the public university is quite another one. The combination of skillful journalism and political maneuvering resulted in the destruction of the career of an exceptionally capable university president. The state where the search was being conducted does not have a Sunshine Law. But it has some unusually determined and ingenious journalists for whom the president of the major state university is almost as important as news about the governor. One of the candidates was president of another Southern university, a sizable one with a

medical school, but not the flagship campus. He informed his board that he was letting his name go forward, though in an exploratory way. He had done so under the promise of confidentiality, as he had not decided to leave his present position. A journalist covering the story of the search telephoned around to newspapers in neighboring states to see if they had any idea as to potential candidates in those states. This led an investigative reporter in the state of this candidate to make telephone calls in which people, even by answering "no comment," gave him enough clues so that he suspected that this president was in fact a candidate. (I should add that one of the tactics used in this case was to check plane reservations and hotel reservations to track down candidates who were being brought for interviews to a neutral location — most search committees are not prepared for this kind of *Washington Post* style journalistic finesse and do not know how to guard against it. This leads to a kind of guerrilla warfare, in which almost anything will be tried, such as bringing people to campus under assumed names, which is awkward to say the least if they are then selected and people feel that they have been deceived.)

At any rate, the leading newspaper in the state where the candidate resides broke the story of his candidacy. It also broke the candidate. The local community turned on him and his family with what can only be described as viciousness. An academic person, he had already offended some alumni whose main interest is in football, and some powerful politicians who were seeking to use the university as a basis for patronage appointments. His university is located in one of the poorer parts of the state, and the common attitude was that naturally, a person of quality would not want to remain there if he could go somewhere else — actually a misjudgment, since the man in question had the confidence of the head of the state system and the state board, and might well have concluded that he was better off where he was than in the flagship campus of a state at least as political and athletically oriented as his own. (I should add that I do not make these remarks about athletics out of an academician's typical anti-jock outlook — I am speaking of a question of degree, and of the extent to which

trustees and alumni, commonly but not only in the South, regard football as the only fall interference with the hunting season, and much the most significant.)

The upshot was that the president was forced to resign despite support from the system head. Hostility was vented on his children in school and on his wife, with the accusation that they must think themselves superior to the locality and all of them. Garbage was dumped at their door. Furthermore, all this made the individual sufficiently "controversial," not succeeding at one place and being forced to resign at another, so that it was impossible for him to seek another presidency. He was fortunate to land a deanship at a relatively new institution.

But the story is not over yet. A search followed, in which the people who had succeeded in ousting the former president insisted that no president be appointed who was not a local resident, preferably already on campus. Many faculty who had been excited by the man who had been dismissed, because he brought new academic standards to the institution, were concerned for scholarship both on the part of students and faculty, and insisted that the search be broadened to extend beyond the state. A candidate was found who would have been a person of exceptional qualities — also a Southerner with wide experience in comparable locations, willing to leave a presidency where he had served with distinction for a dozen years but was ready for another challenge. Although he was uniformly favored by the faculty members of the search committee, and as willing to commit himself to stay for at least five years, the trustees and alumni representatives had their way in choosing someone from within who was so mediocre that no one would want to steal this person away.

X

We see in this instance what might be called the "Who, little us?" syndrome, which is one extreme in the many possibilities in a search, Sometimes the search process will go through a cycle. It will begin with the belief that the college or university is such a wonderful place that it does not need to court people. Candidates will

apply to come because it is so marvelous. The experience then is that they are turned down, and after the search has dragged on for months and months, the euphoria can easily give way, in a typical American mood swing, to its opposite, to a feeling that one might call a Groucho Marx pattern: anybody who wants to be president of our institution can't be any good! They will end up with a candidate far worse than those discarded at earlier points in the search.

XI

In the course of our research, Judith McLaughlin and I have interviewed a number of candidates who, much as in the cases just described, as a result of leaks, have had their careers and in some cases their livelihoods compromised or damaged. For example, if for whatever reason, a candidate is known to have come in second or third in more than a single search, he or she will be labeled "controversial," no matter what the circumstances and no matter how outstandingly the candidate has performed at his or her present locale. Both at that locale and at other potential ones, people will wonder what the other institutions have learned about the candidate that led to his or her being turned down. There are hardly any search committees with the courage to appoint someone who, by whatever series of chances, has gained the label "controversial." Such people have often been fortunate if they could get out of the presidential orbit altogether, and take what can be for many the preferred spot of academic vice president or provost or dean of faculty.

XII

Of course it is generally leaks to the press that create "controversial" people. Several weeks ago the Berkeley student paper, the *Daily Californian,* ran a story, objecting to the secrecy with which the search for the presidency of the University of California had been conducted. Not only did they express typical student views that everything should be out in the open, which are of course typical American views also, but they interviewed the leading education editors in the state. It was interesting to me that Ann Roark, the able

Education Editor of the *Los Angeles Times*, was quoted as saying that, if it came to a choice between educational values and journalistic values, her adherence lay with the latter. She was well aware that the University might be harmed by premature disclosure as indeed it was, not to speak of the candidate who would thus likely become "controversial" in being forced to withdraw.

XIII

The conflict between secrecy and publicity has occurred almost from the beginning in our history. Madison and Hamilton wanted a republican form of government. Jefferson was an intellectual and a democrat. He favored publicity over secrecy, although his letters indicate that he often kept both personal and public matters private. In the era of progressivism we moved toward something closer to direct democracy, the progressives favoring recalls and referenda, as Hiram Johnson did in California before the First World War. In her book, *Participatory Democracy*, the political scientist and sociologist, Jane Mansbridge, reports on her study of Vermont town meetings. What she found was that participatory democracy was less representative than the secret ballot. The slick and manipulative town leaders, the articulate as well as the simplifiers, tended to control town meetings, while silencing the less articulate and less self-confident, except for some outcasts locally regarded as "crazies."

Today one might argue that we are moving beyond what I regard as implausible efforts at participatory democracy in large enterprises — "large" being defined as larger than a small group of friends who trust each other and have only a moderate degree of mutual envy — to plebiscitary democracy, with what I consider such grim results as those illustrated by Proposition 2½ in this state. The plebiscite is the weapon of a few activists manipulating the passive. They need not join a party or inform themselves. They need only check a ballot, or, as in an experiment in Columbus, Ohio, push a button on a television set. However, in the general society as in academia, we can see that there are extreme situations in which plebiscitary democracy, like civil disobe-

2

dience, can have a place. If a plebiscite, as on the nuclear freeze, turned out to be the only way to cut through the combination of ignorance and duplicity on these matters in the White House, the Pentagon, the intelligence agencies (except for the analytic branch of the CIA), and the civilian strategists who are so much more risk-prone than most military men and who have had less experience with Murphy's Law, I would favor such a plebiscite. I do favor it now in the form of a freeze. I admire the Catholic Bishops for their stand on the immorality of planning for nuclear war, and find inspiring the courage of the Archbishops of San Antonio and Seattle in particular, even though I share the view of *Commonweal* magazine, that for the immediate future a minimum nuclear deterrent, preferably in submarines, is a political essential, even though to use such weapons represents such a disproportionality of means to ends as to violate any traditional concepts of a just war.

To return to my subject: just as each historic moment is idiosyncratic, so is each presidential search. We cannot lay down rules but only guidelines, to be modifed as history brings us new contingencies. If there is any general rule, I suppose it is that all values are in competition with other values and none can be pushed to its ultimate without jeopardizing others. In presidential searches, as in the larger public life, there is escape neither from judgment nor from ambiguity.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q — If there is an incumbent president, what is the role usually of the incumbent during the search?

A — During a search I would say incumbent presidents are generally extremely careful not to take any part whatever. I am not talking now of the Jesuit presidents or of the Congrégation Sacré Coeur, where Father Hesburgh has obviously been concerned about finding a successor within that Order. Rumor reports that Father Bartell, former President of Stonehill College and then Director of the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, was at one time under consideration. These are special situations where a priest or a Sister

President, with the religious community, may help to groom a successor. But in general presidents withdraw.

There are some instances where presidents have sought to influence the choice of a successor and, resenting being eased out, have stayed on to crowd that successor. For example, Harold Taylor stayed on the sampus at Sarah Lawrence; he went around and told the young ladies how much better it had been in his day. There are other cases I know where presidents have stayed in the offing. But most presidents are very decent and entirely withdraw from the search. There is one extremely useful function I can see the president performing. This is what the former President of Swarthmore, Theodore Friend, has done. Before retiring, he wrote for his then as yet unchosen successor a memorandum concerning how his day is spent, and what some of the issues facing the College are as he sees them. His wife, Elizabeth Friend, similarly sought to help her successor (although the wife of the new President has her own career and has made it plain that the College will have to get along with a substitute for a presidential hostess). Similarly, Charlotte Sorensen at Babson College wrote a memorandum to her successor as to what the problems were — the unexpected problems of the spouse. Those I think are excellent services that the president and his spouse can perform. Other than that, I think, discretion to help the successor without crowding him or her is the course hoped for. Many ex-presidents cannot leave. If they have come from academic life, they generally ask for tenure in their field. Sometimes an ex-president is made president of a private foundation that frequently is set up to assist a public university. But most presidential families think it the better course to leave the scene.

Q— I was wondering if your research discovered any difference in the process or the result of the search on campuses that were usually kept highly unionized versus campuses that retain . . . .

A — Yes, I am glad that you asked about unionized campuses. I have what some might regard as a bigoted antagonism toward faculty unionism, although there are differences among unions, depending on the context. I would like to give you an example of the ways in which a union

can influence and indeed damage a presidential search. A particularly adversarial chapter of a national union went to the president of a state university who was assumed to be restless to move to another presidency after ten arduous and on the whole strikingly successful years. The union had demands in terms of compensation and also grievance procedures for promotion, especially in tenure cases, on behalf of which the union representatives did not want to walk off the job, because they had already had two strikes, neither of which gained much ground. They went to the President and said to him that if he didn't give in, he would never get another presidency. Thereafter the President was a candidate for the leadership of another more distinguished state university, a campus which has a chapter of the same union. Although I was told by one member of the search committee that the President in question was probably the most qualified candidate, the union successfully blackballed him. (Unions are stronger in the states with powerful labor movements, where a collective bargaining law may facilitate the unionization of those regarded as state employees.) After several more tries to obtain a position in unionized settings, the President gave up such efforts, and an executive whom I regard as exceedingly capable was lost for the top position. I have had letters from search committees asking me for suggestions concerning both presidents and state system heads in which experience with collective bargaining is one of the preferred criteria for a candidate — "experience" presumably meaning ability to get along with and placate a faculty union. In the instances I have in mind, it is not experience with unionism among buildings and grounds workers or clerical staff that is the stumbling block, but a faculty union.

At their not uncommon worst, faculty unions through the exercise of grievance procedures they helped create lead to almost automatic promotion of all tenure-track faculty, with the union's legal counsel in the offing in case the grievance procedures do not themselves carry the day. Unions are sometimes voted in where collegiality has already been destroyed; in other cases, they tend to destroy whatever collegiality there is, and its potential for the future. One reason is

that it is generally, although by no means invariably, the less scholarly faculty who have time and interest for union activity, coupled in some instances of the more high-power state universities with a scattering of Marxists and other radicals for whom their image of the working class is sacred, and membership in the working class is believed to require powerful union sympathies. A friend of mind who had once been active in the labor movement before becoming a professor told me with chagrin that on his well-known campus, where unionism is exceptionally strong, he hardly dares write a letter to a member of the faculty without consulting counsel. Union activists he knows are not only not the scholars, but not the most dedicated teachers; they no more carry a full load than is the case with many shop stewards in a factory.

I recall speaking to members and students in the Sociology Department at Florida State University eight years ago at a time when efforts to unionize that campus as well as other state universities were under way. I contended that the union was not likely to produce additional compensation over the long run, since there was only so much money and the governor and legislature were not prepared to impose additional taxes. One bearded sociologist arose to bang the table and to declare, "We want clout!" I reminded him that there was no truancy law governing post-secondary education, and that a strike would not necessarily lead to concessions from limited resources. Understandably, I persuaded almost no one in that group. After the first collective bargaining agreement was signed, many faculty members realized that they did not benefit. The Regents, angered by the union drive and its adversarial posture, cut appropriations. The contract did increase overall pay, and to make up for the boost in salaries, money for sabbaticals was cut, and money for secretaries and other campus services. It was my sense of the matter that the NEA-affiliated union wanted to show in other states that they could get more money for faculty, and were willing to make concessions to what now was "management" in order to obtain this advertising bonus. Recognizing this, and the cost of union dues, some faculty wanted to decertify the union, but they were stuck with it.

There are cases where, as in industry, bad presidents create a union, but I have known other cases (Ithaca College is one of them, where my friend James Whalen is President, who was President as many of you know of Newton College of the Sacred Heart, where faculty unionized to prevent the president from saving the place by adaptation. I talked to one of his faculty members and said to her that she and her colleagues were behaving like the railroad unions. She replied with deep cynicism: "It will last my lifetime." She was perhaps wrong about that. There is no guarantee that it will.

Q — Have you investigated the role of the spouse of women college presidents? How many women college presidents are married and what does the search committee do then?

A — Yes, I have, and if you have the names of such spouses, I would be glad to have them, because I am trying to understand such situations better. The number of women who are presidents either of the remaining women's colleges or of coeducational institutions and who are currently married is relatively small. There is Adele Simmons at Hampshire College who has a supportive spouse. When Alberta Arthurs was at Chatham College in Pittsburgh, she had a supportive spouse. When former Sister Jacqueline, now Jacqueline Wexler, was President of Hunter College, she had a supportive spouse. But I have met other preisdents both at women's colleges and of coeducational colleges who are married and who are proudly independent; I recall one telling me that her husband has never been nearer the campus than 200 miles! I think the situation is asymmetrical — the male spouse who is "too active" is regarded as interfering — too active in the affairs of the instituion. (Of course, the wives of male presidents may also be seen as threateningly knowledgeable and influential — "the power behind the throne.") Generally, the male spouse's role is to be supportive, and as is increasingly the case among young educated couples, helping with children when there are young children.

I remarked at supper that there is someone working at Connecticut College who is doing a study of this subject, as a dissertation for the University at Storrs, who wants the names of just

such people to interview. It is my impression that most women's college presidents are single or divorced; few have spouses. I think it says something about our society that this is the case.

Q — I am interested in the effects of your research on the presidential search and on the reception of institutions about how to do that search. This is the kind of research that isn't done very much, in fact, not at all, and just putting your attention on it must have an effect on institutions themselves and I am curious about maybe just to hear some stories about the response to you.

A — Judy [Mrs. Judith McLaughlin], would you want to comment on that? Would you feel you wanted to say something about that?

Judith McLaughlin — I think people haven't really seen it as an institutional event in many cases, but as something which is happening only at one important moment, not recognizing the ramifications the search and selection have for institutional direction, the kind of statements the search procedure and the choice will make about the institution at that point in time. It is true that, as you go into an institution and begin to ask those questions, it raises the search to a level of attention that they have gotten in terms of curiosity as to the candidate's work but not as the important event that it is.

David Riesman — I would add that in several of the educational agencies my interest may have had an effect on the program. At the meeting of the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities in Louisville held in October, I chaired a session on the presidential spouse at which there was an equal balance of men and women trustees, presidents, and others, and dealt with the question of what kind of support network could be built around the presidential family. In seeking to make a campus attractive to a spouse, what kind of information would be useful to provide the couple, tailored to that couple's particular situation, which of course could not be predicted in advance of the search? In one search which Judith McLaughlin and I followed, we interviewed a single woman who was the successful candidate to become the first woman president of a women's college in the South. In the concluding negotiations, the male chairman of the board brought with him a woman trustee who

could talk with the candidate about what kinds of hosting arrangements might be made, what kinds of needs did she have.

In the Minnesota State College and University System, perhaps out of a misinterpretation of the requirements for Affirmative Action, or of contemporary feminism, spouses of male and female candidates are not brought to the campus. One reported that she was told that her husband could rent a car and come to the campus if he wished on his own. Women spouses, of course more common, were similarly discouraged. Some might want to meet the Academic Vice President or the Director of Development or other leading people with whom the husband would have to deal, so that if the question should they accept arose, she could help him decide, aided by what I consider the likelihood of her better judgment. In other cases she wanted to know what the opportunities would be in the community for her interests, be they musical, professional in other respects, or schooling for the children. Usually when female spouses come and are attended to, the assumptions are of a traditional sort. She's taken to the local art museum or the zoo or entertained by local wives, and so on, and it is not what most of today's spouses want. By raising this issue, I may possibly have helped sensitize several state systems and institutions to be more attentive to the variegated needs of spouses.

At the annual meeting in January of the Association of American Colleges, I had an opportunity to alert some of the predominantly private institutions which make up the bulk of the AAC to the importance of the search process as setting the parameters for the wellbeing or the malaise of the presidential family. A candidate, asked on a visit to campus all sorts of questions concerning attitudes toward tenure, toward Affirmative Action, toward budgeting and planning, toward any conceivable aspect of the multifaceted presidential task, generally wants to appear all-competent and all-knowing. But on arrival from outside, or even from some positions inside, the president finds himself or herself exceptionally vulnerable. The successful candidate has made a presentation of self to the search committee and, in most cases, to various campus consituencies, of virtual omnicompetence. How difficult, then,

for the neophyte president to come to the chairman of the board and to say, "I can't cope with this situation," or "I'm not familiar with this kind of management information system." I suggested that the situation of the president is analagous to that of a big city mayor — constantly on call, anything can go wrong. Consider Frank Newman: when he arrived at the University of Rhode Island from Stanford, the plumbing had just broken down. Parents were calling constantly, worried that the sanitation didn't exist, what were their offspring eating, what was the situation of the lavatories, and so on. He found himself suddenly dealing with the plumbers union, becoming something of a pumber, coping with sanitation, and engulfed in public relations. That's the problem of a big city mayor, except the family of the big city mayor probably suffers less.

There are also instances where I have been consulted by a search committee concerning procedures or the potential value of a professional search consultant. I would like to say a word about these services. Judith McLaughlin and I have learned a great deal from consultants. I was asked by one search committee to recommend a consultant who would be appropriate for them; I gave them four names, and suggested that they interview a representative from each group, both nonprofit, as in the case of the ACC and American Council on Education-sponsored Presidential Search Consultation Service, and an executive search firm which specializes in academic recruiting. Correspondingly, I would be inclined to say that my interest in the search process has had some effect both on particular searches and in alerting governing boards to some previously unconsidered aspects of the search process, as well as some experience in alerting candidates to the hazards and opportunities of their candidacy and the problems of negotiating a relationship if they should be chosen. For me the most frightening experience has come in cases where search committees have placed some reliance on my judgment among competing candidates and where the person I had put at the top has been chosen, when my knowledge of both the person and the institution is slender, and where I am anxious as to whether or not the person chosen will in fact prove suitable.

Q — During your speech, you hinted that students are often overly presumptuous in insisting upon their right to know when a search is going on — and later you hinted that presidents are often managerial and administrative. I was wondering what you feel the proper attitude the student body should take when a search is going on in relation to the candidate and later in what role should the students treat the incoming president?

A — To speak to the last part of your question first, nothing is sadder than the inability of presidents to see as much of students as many would like. There is a letter written to the student paper by Stephen Trachtenberg, the energetic and indeed entrepreneurial President of the University of Hartford, in which he was asked by a student to come to dinner or to some event and he had to decline because of some external demand upon his calendar. And the student had wanted him to come that very week. He tried to explain to the student what kinds of pressure there are on the president's day. It is very hard to get that across.

To unwind your question back to its beginning, I spoke of *faculty* leaks. I know of no *student* leaks. Students on search committees are often under terrific pressure, arguments that they have been co-opted, pressures from roommates, pressures from girlfriends or boyfriends, but have been in every case I know, and there may be exceptions, so firm that journalists have been able to get nothing out of them. It is faculty who have leaked, through vanity or malice or interest-group politics. The third thing I would say is that students should have an input early and should be consulted as all other constituencies should be as to what the institution needs. For example, I would say that many institutions need to have a more coherent life in the extra-curriculum. I believe that the abandonment of parietal rules has not been a blessing. I believe that the institutions which try to keep some control over the relations between and among the sexes on campus, and over the standard messiness of much dormitory life, are wise but rare. And I think that presidents and presidential candidates ought to visit the dormitories.

I know a candidate who withdrew from the search for the Presidency of a major liberal arts

college after having passed the first screening by the search committee and after she had been brought to the campus for a second such meeting. After visiting the dormitories, she came away dismayed to discover that there were no bulletin boards carrying notice of activities; students didn't get away from the campus and into the nearby metropolis. She concluded that this splendid college was gloomy, depressed, overly competitive; she didn't want to be there. She had talked to students and she got a sense of what student life was like. So I would say students can help candidates tremendously to get a sense of the place thay they would get in no other way because certainly she didn't get this sense from others who were eager to have her, whereas students were candid. On the other hand, the student paper raised hell about the secrecy of the search and about the choice that was made. They had not had any notice about the person who was chosen at the last minute, at a point where the trustees had decided to abort the search and to start over again. Fortunately, the antagonism died down and the institution now has a president for whom the students appear to have high regard. In this case, the college would have been damaged if it had been too vulnerable to the student judgment concerning their right to know everything that was happening. Moreover, candidates can flatter students as they can flatter faculty.

Still, I think student judgments matter very much and, to come back again to your question of the role of the president vis-a-vis students, what the students fail to see is that the presidents are often more on their side that the faculty are. The ju-jitsu act that the president performs is to try to use students against faculty. Faculty are commonly able to persuade students that they and the students are united, that the administration is "they" and the students and faculty are "we," whereas in fact it is students united with the administration against the faculty in many institutions. That doesn't fully answer your question.

Q — How can one distinguish between issues that should be decided by full disclosure and those where you believe that secrecy and confidentiality are justifiable? Does it simply depend on what your side of a controversy at the moment is?

A — Well, I think I can only illustrate my outlook by an example. I am inclined to conclude that only in urgent matters of life and death — which is why I use the example of someone leaking to the press a plan to initiate a nuclear attack — is it justifiable in a democracy to betray one's colleagues and the tacit or actual promise of confidentiality. It is ironical that the various measures toward plebiscitary democracy which now are used by the Right Wing were invented by liberals. Thus as you probably know Hiram Johnson and others in the Progressive Era at the turn of the century and before the First World War succeeded in states like California in securing the plebiscitary recall, by which office-holders can be removed on petition, followed by a vote, or referendum, as one sees in Proposition 9 in California or Proposition 2½ in this state. We see that the decline of party discipline in Congress makes it vulnerable to something like the lobby of the bankers and their clients against the banks' paying withholding taxes on interest and dividends of their depositors. So I would say it is justified in matters of life and death in this country, but if I am asked about other countries, Argentina, Brazil, Vietnam, wherever, I would have to know a lot more about the culture before I could answer you. And again, I would say that history will surprise us, and we will come to cases where complete openness may be advantageous, but at present I would confine it to matters of whether the planet survives or not.

Q — Mr. Riesman, would you accept employment as president of a college or university?

A — I was asked that, actually much to my surprise, when I was quite young. I immediately declined, concluding that I lacked the qualities, such as patience, that were required. For example, I knew that I could get furious at meetings. Then and later I have been to too many meetings where the person in the chair does not keep people to time, and I become too impatient. I do not have the calm stoicism that is requisite, and I think I would be a dreadfully poor president; as I think you can see from what I have said here, I have a great deal of sympathy for many presidents, and I do not mind advising them.

Individual copies of this lecture may be obtained upon request from:

Boston College
School of Education
Office of the Dean
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167